



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/719,466	12/12/2000	Dirk Tillenburg	MOE209	8810

7590

08/05/2003

Horst M Kasper
13 Forest Drive
Warren, NJ 07059

EXAMINER

LEJA, RONALD W

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2836

DATE MAILED: 08/05/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/719,466

Applicant(s)

TILLENBURG, DIRK

Examiner

Ronald W Leja

Art Unit

2836

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or 120.
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in a provisional application.
 - ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in a provisional application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 20 and/or 121).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority.
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provided.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-893)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Page(s) _____

Art Unit: 2836

This application does not contain an abstract of the disclosure as required by 37 CFR 1.72(b). An abstract on a separate sheet is required.

The application does not contain a copy of the Priority document.

Claims 1-10 are objected to because of the following informalities: There are many instances of lack of antecedent basis within the claims. For example, in Claim 1, there is a lack of antecedent basis for "the feed line", "the general supply line", "the lower disposed supply potential", "the supply voltage". Due to the numerous lack of antecedent basis problems, Applicant is advised to check all claims carefully. Claim 6 has a lack of antecedent basis for "the neutral conductor". Appropriate correction is required.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is confusing in general. The metes and bounds of the claim are not known with the phrase "in particular driver modules". Claim 1 initially recites "a protective diode" being disposed in the feed line, but later recites " a first protective diode ... is disposed in the feed line"; are these the same diodes? What is meant by "for circuit parts predisposed to the module and fed by the lower disposed supply potential"? What is meant in Claim 2 by "diode is furnished in a presence of several modules"? Is not the "a common first protective diode" of Claim 2, already recited within Claim 1? What is meant by

Art Unit: 2836

"a second protective diode is coordinated to each module"? What is meant by "in case of proper polarity of the supply voltage in the forward direction" in Claim 4? What is exactly meant by "circuit parts predisposed to the modules"? From the Figures is it difficult to determine whether the "a protective diode" and the "a first protective diode" in Claim 4 are two separate diodes? Does Claim 5 add an additional "first protective diode"? Again, but in claim 5 this time, what is meant by "furnished in a presence of" and "is coordinated to each"? Claims 6-9 discuss a neutral conductor and connections to the conductor. However, in the figures, such connections appear to be to ground (GND). Which way are the connections?

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Adams (3,675,141).

As best as the claim language can be understood, the following rejection has been provided. Adams discloses various modules and as seen in Figure 4, the modules (more than one for Claims 2 & 5) have protective diodes (185, 186 and 187) connected between them and an output line. Resistors (257-262) are considered to be load resistors.

Art Unit: 2836

Although GND is applied to terminal (132), the line at 139 is an output line. Between circuit part (246) and the modules is a first protective diode (198) with its cathode leading to the lower supply potential GND. Diodes are well known to offer isolation between differing potentials and as such, in view of Adams, it would have been obvious to apply their use between modules and GND potential as a means to buffer or isolate the modules from the supply line, thereby gaining in safety. This helps to prevent havoc resulting from an unintentionally applied voltage to the circuit resulting in damages. Official notice is taken for (Claims 7-9) the use of resistors and capacitors and zener diodes being coupled between supply and a neutral so as to offer additional protection from transients. Such is well known in the protection art and it would have been obvious to apply the teachings to any circuit having supply and neutral conductors and wherein additional transient protection was desired, resulting in a more reliable and durable end product.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald W Leja whose telephone number is (703)308-2008. The examiner can normally be reached on mon-fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Brian Sircus can be reached on (703)308-3119. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this

Art Unit: 2836

application or proceeding is assigned are (703)305-3432 for regular communications and (703)305-3431 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3675.


Ronald W Leja
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2836

rw1
July 28, 2003

